DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 809 CE 034 267

AUTHOR Baker, Therese L.; Sween, Joyce A.
TITLE Synchronizing Post-Graduate Career, Marriage, and Fertility.
INSTITUTION De Paul Univ., Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE [Sep 82]
CONTRACT PHS-NO1-HD-92816
NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (San Francisco, CA, September 6-10, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; Careers; *College Graduates; Employed Parents; Employed Women; *Employment Patterns; *Family Characteristics; Family Role; Family Structure; *Females; Graduate Surveys; *Marital Status; Mothers; *Occupational Aspiration; Parent Role; Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS Life Cycles

ABSTRACT

A study attempted to discover the significance of the early post-graduate career pattern on later career outcomes for women at varying points in their life course. Data were from a national sample of United States graduates of four-year colleges and universities at five points in time from their graduation in spring, 1961 until 7 years later. Early career patterns were studied in relation to changing marital and fertility statuses and in relation to long-range career activities, attainments, and family formation characteristics at a later time. Interaction of the career pattern and marital/fertility status was shown to be contingent on earlier career preferences and affected attitudes toward employment subsequently. The career preferences suggested the type of meshing between career and family roles that women desired (to pursue only a career, exclusive of housewifery, or vice versa). A close relationship was shown between the timing of the birth of the oldest child and career patterns. A cumulative impact of earlier patterns and interactions of career and family situations on later career outcomes was also indicated. Strong evidence suggested that post-graduate work experiences (or lack of them) were predictive of later career, marriage, and fertility statuses. (Data tables are appended.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223809

Synchronizing Post-Graduate Career, Marriage, and Fertility*

Therese L. Baker and Joyce A. Sween
Department of Sociology
DePaul University
Chicago, Illinois

CE 034267

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Baker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

*This research was generously supported by the National Institute of Child Health and Development, U.S. Public Health Service NO1-HD-92816, and by DePaul University.

SYNCHRONIZING POST-GRADUATE CAREER,MARRIAGE,AND FERTILITY

Studies of the life course take as one of their major points of analysis the transition points at which individual career paths intersect changing family situations. For Hareven, an essential feature of life course analysis is the study of the "timing and synchronization of transitions", the "interrelationships of individual transitions and changing family configurations" (Hareven 1978a: 100). By considering the timing and interrelationship among career, marriage and fertility at crucial change points (such as entry to the labor force, getting married, or having a child), we may gain a better understanding of the mutual consequences of individual activities and family conditions. Studies of synchronization may reveal ..."the meshing of individual careers within the family unit as it changes over time, and especially ... the coordination of several possibly distinct roles, such as work and family" (Hareven 1978a: 100).

Although the idea of a "life cycle" has been used widely in studying women's careers, Hareven stresses the preferability of the "life course" model. The "life cycle" approach, she argues, tends to reify the stages of the development of the family, viewed as a collective unit, thereby neglecting the study of the development of the individual within the family. In contrast,

the "life course" model emphasizes the contingent aspects of family life by focusing on the transitions that result from the interaction of the individual and the collective family development (Hareven 1978a: 97-100).

Consideration of synchronization as the feature of life course analysis suggests a distinction between life course analysis and the model of the family life cycle. Such models include a number of different stages in the development of the family, but in nearly all cases the period of marriage prior to the birth of a first child is specified as the first stage. Additional stages typically consist of a period with infant children, one with grown children, an "empty nest" stage, and finally the death of the head of household (Hill 1964; Glick 1947; Glick 1977; Nock 1979; Spanier, Sauer, and Larzelere 1979). Thus the family life cycle model sets up discrete stages in which the activities of indiciduals in these stages appear to be determined by their stage location--in other words where individuals are viewed largely as functioning in roles.

The life course model, in contradistinction to the family life cycle model, is more continuous and dynamic, and the activities of individuals as they enter and leave various stages of the family cycle, even though they are necessarily contingent on this stage, appear more as the result of options pursued, choices made, actions undertaken. It is this dynamic, interactive quality of life course analysis that makes the issue of synchronization so critical. For if the individual has options, than he or she can both select (influence) the timing of certain activities and, in some instances, the entry into more

advanced stages of the family cycle so as to try to mesh individual activities with family situation in an advantageous way.

Career and childrearing have frequently been treated in terms of life stage models. In these terms, they are seen as interdependent, often conflicting, roles, entered less by choice than circumstance (Elder 1978: 26). Women facing such conflicting demands have been diagnosed as suffering from "role overload" (Rapoport and Rapoport 1969); and young professionals with small children have been considered to be in a "life cycle squeeze" (Estes and Wilensky 1978). In contrast, Waite, in her examination of the relationship between stage of the family life cycle and women's paid employment, emphasizes that family stage may not be the cause of a woman's decision about whether to work. On the contrary, it may itself depend on her labor market activity (1980: 275). In other words, the individual career role may be as much a determinant of the collective family situation as the product of it.

Studying women's work activities during the early stages may be critical to our understanding of women's career development, because initial career-forming activities often coincide with early stages of family formation (Young 1978; Rosenzweig and Wolpin 1980). This is even more likely to be true for highly educated women. Because educated women generally delay marriage and childbearing until the completion of their degrees, early career activities or post-graduate studies consequently overlap with marriage and early childbearing years. A woman must either mesh her home and career activities or postpone marriage and/or

fertility in order to pursue her career goals singlemindedly.

For highly educated women, the second stage of the family cycle--when young infants and children are present-- may be particularly problematic. On the one hand, their educational level makes it costly for them to stay out of the labor market (Leibowitz 1975). On the other hand, highly educated mothers of young children may drop out or postpone entry into the labor force because they believe that successful childrearing requires their presence at home (Waite 1980: 280). Nevertheless Waite finds that while college educated young wives and mothers may avoid the potential conflict between work and childrearing by staying out of the labor market, they are more likely than those with lower levels of formal schooling to work during the early years of marriage. "Education increases the likelihood of labor force participation about twice as much for childless wives and for others who expect more children as for those who have completed childbearing" (Waite 1980: 290).

One problem in studying the life course (the combination of career and family roles) of young women is to try to establish the typical ordering of life events. Hogan (1978, 1980) has characterized the normative pattern for young men as the completion of schooling, followed by the commencement of a job, followed by marriage. He finds that maintaining this order is advantageous. Even though increasing proportions of young men who advance to graduate training marry before completing their graduate schooling (and thereby diverge from the typical pattern), the data from the Occupational Changes in a Generation II survey indicate that men who marry first earn less than those

who finish schooling and initiate a career prior to marriage (Hogan 1980: 273).

For educated women, a hypothetical pattern of life events might be similar to men's: completion of college, followed by initiation of a career, followed by marriage. It might be logical, therefore, to ask the extent to which educated women who diverge from this normative order pay a penalty in terms of their career outcomes. But there is a major difference between men and women in the meaning(s) they attribute to "marriage". For both, marriage usually signifies the commencement of a family of procreation; but men do not expect it to displace their primary career activities, while for women it may mean precisely that. Thus while Hogan (1978) can identify for men a pattern of school completion, career initiation , and marriage--as if these were three distinct, ordered steps which determine a career outcome--the more problematic interrelationship between marriage and career for women makes this order less predictive of career outcomes.

For women, marriage has traditionally implied the absence or end of an outside career and the commencement of the career of housewife; in such a pattern the importance of the pre-marriage career may be minimal, as may the importance of schooling itself. In describing a certain order of life events as "normative" for men, Hogan seems to suggest both that the order typifies the lives of most men and that it is desirable (i.e., advantageous in terms of career outcomes). Neither of these implications may be true for women. The normative order, in the sense of the most common pattern, may apply to a much smaller proportion of women;

the normative order, in the sense of the most desirable pattern, may be less widely ascribed to by women.

Thus a first step in the study of the order of life events for women is to clarify women's career goals and the effects of marriage on career activities. The interrelationships of women's career and family cycle position have been changing rapidly in recent historical times. By focusing on an educated cohort of women from the relatively recent past, this study will attempt to discover the significance of the early post-graduate career pattern on later career outcomes for women at varying points in the life course.

Data

Another essential feature of life course study is consideration of the "impact of historical processes on the timing of individual or family transitions" (Hareven 1978a: 101). While the present paper is not an historical study by intention, its data derive from a longitudinal set of surveys from the 1960s, which should be viewed in terms of the conditions and norms of that decade. The data provide evidence on the life situations of a national sample of United States graduates of four-year colleges and universities at five points in time from their graduation in the spring of 1961 until seven years beyond that point (Davis, 1964). In a sample of college graduates drawn prior to the full flowering of the "new feminism" in the mid-Sixties, many of the women surely fit Turner's (1964) description of the "traditional woman": she who, even if

planning to follow a career, conceived of it as merely supplementary to her prospective husband's. The analysis therefore focuses on a highly educated cohort of American women born between 1938 and 1940, at the end of the Great Depression and at the start of the Second World War. These women were educated in the 1950s, a period of conservatism and prosperity. They may have held values of middle class conformity and security similar to those of university-educated women studied by Simpson and Simpson (1961: 383).

The two-stage probability sample first selected 135 colleges and universities representative of all four year institutions in the United States and then sampled prospective graduates of the 1961 spring term within these selected colleges. Re-surveys were made in 1962, 1963, and 1964, and in 1968 a thirty percent subsample of those who had responded to all five earlier waves was re-surveyed. The possibility of sample response bias for the 1968 survey was investigated by Bielby (1975) who found no appreciable differences in demographic characteristics, though white, Protestant respondents tended to remain in the longitudinal sample disproportionately, as did those who had a record of successes in their college careers. In order to control the range of experiences that women might be confronting at this time, an age cohort with the following characteristics was selected for the present study: aged 20 to 22 years at graduation, white, United States citizens, and childless at the time of graduation. Furthermore, women who were divorced, separated, or widowed at any point over the years of the study were excluded.

The data in this study are particularly suitable for a life course analysis because they span a seven year period of crucial importance in the lives of the highly educated--the years immediately following college graduation. In addition, they cover the peak years of marriage and fertility which necessarily converge with early career patterns. The data provide not only measures of statuses and activities at each of five time points, but also attitudinal measures of career intentions and sentiments over time.

Analyses

The longitudinal nature of the data makes it possible to uncover early career patterns as they develop. These early career patterns can then be studied (1) in relation to changing marital and fertility statuses; and (2) in relation to longer-range career activities, attainments, and family formation characteristics at a later time. This second type of analysis will allow an exploration of Hareven's third essential feature of life course analyses--namely to examine the cumulative impact of earlier transitions on later ones (1978a: 102). In this study, the early transitions occur within a three-year time period immediately following graduation from college. The later time point refers to the period seven years following college graduation.

"Table 1 about here"

Following graduation, a number of different career paths were open to the women in the sample: full-time employment, part-time employment, enrollment in graduate school, combining graduate school with either full- or part-time employment, or full-time housewifery. Table 1 presents the fifteen major post-graduate career patterns in order of their frequency. They ranged from continued[1] full-time employment over the three post-graduate years (Pattern 1)--the most common pattern, representing one third of the sample--to a number of infrequent patterns representing about one percent of the sample. The more common patterns include dropping out of work in the third post-graduate year (Pattern 2); dropping out in the second year (Pattern 3); housewifery with no labor force experience (Pattern 4). While the most common pattern is continued full-time employment the next most common patterns suggest that marriage and motherhood increasingly impinge on women's early career lives: taken together, Patterns 2, 3, and 4 account for roughly 25 per cent of the sample. Patterns 7 and 8 each include a year of graduate school but at different points in time. Similarly, Patterns 9 and 12 each include part-time employment; but in the first case it follows two years of full-time employment, while in the second it is situated between full-time employment and housewifery.

---

[1] "Continued" employment here means that respondents stated that they were employed on October 1 of each of three consecutive years. It is, of course, possible that someone would drop out of work during the year and re-enter before the next October 1.

Patterns 10 and 14 indicate continued graduate school attendance. Taken together these fifteen patterns suggest that the period following graduation is transitional: full-time employment may be initiated, but is often given up; graduate school may be pursued but usually for only a year and increasing proportions of women become housewives over time.

The reasons for these shifts become clearer from a rank ordering of the pattern groups by marital/fertility status in the third post-graduate year (Table 1). For those women who remained single over the three years, nearly two-thirds were employed full-time and another twelve percent combined work with a year of graduate school experience. For women who were married but childless in 1964, Pattern 1 is also dominant; but dropping out of the labor force after the second post-graduate year is the second strongest pattern. In addition, Patterns 5 and 6 are also quite common for the married childless group. The pattern rankings alter dramatically for mothers in the sample. For mothers of one child, Patterns 2 and 3 are most frequent, indicating that "early mothers" usually had some labor force experience, though fourteen percent had none (Pattern 4). For mothers of two children, dropping out after the first year (Pattern 3) or consecutive full-time housewifery (Pattern 4) accounted for nearly everyone.

"Table 2 about here"

Table 1 indicates that the first six patterns, accounting for approximately two-thirds of the sample, include the top three

ranked patterns for each of the marital/fertility status groups. These six patterns provide the focus for the following analyses. Table 2 shows how an early long-run preference for employment in relation to housewifery is associated with the six major career patterns. The preference, measured in the year following college graduation, serves as a possible indicator of what career course a woman might follow. The relationship between preferences and career course would be likely to be modified by the marital-fertility status of the woman. The long-run preferences represent degrees of desired employment or housewifery ranging from employment only, to combining employment with housewifery, to postponing employment, to wanting occasional employment, to housewifery only.

The most striking finding for single women is that an early preference for either employment only or combining employment with housewifery, is strongly associated with continued full-time employment in the first three post-graduate years. However, this is not the case for married women--very few of whom held such initially strong career preferences. Among women who preferred to delay employment and were childless, early careers often include graduate studies as well as full-time work. Of those who wanted in the long-run to be housewives, there is a tendency to drop out of work earlier (for the initially single women) or to not work at all (for the initially married childless women). For the early mothers who had no desire to synchronize career with family obligations (i.e., had a long-run preference for the housewife role), post-graduation employment was either given up after one year or not undertaken. On the other hand, mothers who

wanted to combine employment with housewifery more often worked and went to graduate school (FFG/F) and were less often full-time housewives (HHH) over the three-year span. The realization of initial preferences in terms of actual careers followed, is heavily affected by marital/fertility status.

"Table 3 about here"

While Table 2 indicated a long-run preference, an aspiration for the future, Table 3 presents a short-run attitude, an affect for a current activity (full-time employment) in which the woman might or might not be involved. While the preference in Table 2 preceded the career pattern temporally, the attitude in Table 3 is measured at the culmination of the career pattern period. There is clear evidence that feeling "very positive" toward full-time employment depended upon the experience of a full-time career over a consecutive period of time. Among the married childless women, Patterns 1, 5, and 6 included majorities with strong positive responses. Among the few mothers who had consecutive employment patterns, attitudes toward full-time employment were positive. Conversely, large proportions of mothers with little or no work experience following college graduation held "very negative" attitudes toward full-time employment. Clearly these women's early career experiences molded their point of view, and because their experiences varied with fertility status, so did their point of view.

"Table 4 about here"

Table 4 lays out career activities, attainments and satisfaction in 1968 in relation to the early career course and later (1968) marital and fertility status. In other words, it examines how women who followed different career tangents after college graduation ended up in 1968 with varying career outcomes. In terms of 1968 career activities, single women were almost all full-time employees in 1968, with some in graduate school as well. Part-time employment was very uncommon for single women, although less so for those who had continued to work in the three post-graduate years (FFF).

As was the case for single women, earlier full-time employment among the married childless fostered later full-time employment and graduate school attendance. Mothers of one child (in the second stage of the family life cycle) were quite similar to the married childless, if they shared similar early career patterns. Yet the Pattern 1 mothers of one child were much more likely to be employed full-time in 1968 than were the Pattern 3 or Pattern 4 mothers whose lack of early career experience appeared to be an important factor in precluding their participation in the full-time labor force. None of the early housewives (HHH) were employed full-time in 1968 or enrolled in graduate school. Among mothers of two or more, a larger proportion (12.9%) of those who had followed an early pattern of continued full-time employment (Pattern 1) were working full-time in 1968 than for any other early career pattern group. This means that the early option to work once taken and continued had longer-term effects on later careers even of women in stages of

the family life cycle where they had two young children.

Occupational prestige in 1968 was also affected by the association of each career activities and family position. The occupation a woman held in 1968 was scored on the National Opinion Research Center's Occupational Prestige Scale (Hodge and Siegel 1964; Hodge, Siegel, and Rossi 1964) and this score was then trichotimized into low, middle, and high status. Housewives in 1968 were placed in a fourth category. Since this is a study of the 1960s, when graduate women were often employed as school teachers, the middle-level ranking is largely comprised of teachers. Entering graduate school following two years of full-time employment (FFG/F) seemed to enhance 1968 career status for single women. For single women and married women with fewer than two children, consecutive early full-time career (Patterns 1 and 6) more often culminated in a middle-status career seven years following graduation. Regardless of their early career patterns following college graduation, an overwhelming proportion of multiple parity women were housewives in 1968--although the lowest proportion of housewives occurs for those who had early full-time employment (Pattern 1). For the few multiple parity women employed in 1968, occupational prestige was almost never high.

Finally, Table 4 examines whether career is considered to be the major source of life satisfaction. Among the single women with early full-time career experience (Patterns 1, 5, and 6), viewing a career as a major source of life satisfaction was more common for those with early graduate school experience. Very small proportions of married childless women regarded a career as

their major source of life satisfaction. Among mothers, considering a career to be a major source of life satisfaction in 1968 was unusual, but it was more common for those with early full-time work (Pattern 1).

Another essential feature of life course analysis is an effort to assess the impact of earlier transitions on later ones. Although early post-graduate career patterns reveal the transitional career paths taken by women following college graduation, such patterns may themselves be considered outcomes in relation to earlier time periods. In these terms, career patterns become dependent variables, predicted from some set of antecedent variables. Conversely, early career patterns may be considered in relation to later events (as in Table 4). The discriminant analyses in Table 5 assume both of these strategies; they determine whether sets of pre- and post-pattern variables discriminate among the six major early career pattern groups.

"Table 5 about here"

Table 5 presents summary statistics for three discriminant analyses. Forward stepwise procedures are used where the order of the variables entered is based on their ability to discriminate among the career patterns. Variables which fail to add to the discrimination level are not entered. The first discriminant analysis includes a set of variables representing a woman's family of origin. The relative importance of each variable to the discriminating functions is indicated by the

standardized coefficients. The first and strongest function is based on the contributions of variables representing social class origin: having a college graduate father, having a father with high occupational prestige, and having few siblings. For the second function, not being reared in a small town and a Catholic upbringing are the strongest determinants. Yet the low levels of the eigenvalues mean that the variables in this first analysis are not capable of separating the six groups to a high degree. The canonical correlation, a measure of the degree of relatedness between the groups and the discriminant functions, indicates a low associations between the groups and the functions (.258 and separation between groups, shows that only the first four variables helped to differentiate the groups significantly.

In the second discriminant analysis, pre-career pattern variables are included: the quality of the undergraduate college or university (expressed as "high" or "not high" on the National Opinion Research Center's School Quality Index, see Davis 1964); high undergraduate grade point average (expressed as A or not A); and a strong preference for a career at the time of graduation. For this second analysis, grade point average is the major component of function 1, with college quality making a contribution; strong preference for future employment is the primary contributor to function 2. The low eigenvalues indicate that neither function separates the groups to a high degree, and the canonical correlations are of the same moderately low level as in the first analysis. Yet the Rao's V suggests that the variables tend to separate the groups, and the change due to the addition of each variable significantly increases this

separation.

In the final discriminant analysis, the variables represent career outcomes and marital/fertility statuses in 1968 four years beyond the end of the career pattern years 1962, 1963, and 1964. In this case, three functions are produced. The first, with a high eigenvalue and canonical correlation, shows the function to be highly related to the groups. The strongest standardized canonical coefficient in this function was the age of oldest child which carries a negative sign. Thus the major determinant of the first function is "recentness" of the birth of the oldest child.

The second function has as its major determinant not having attained a graduate degree and has a moderately high eigenvalue (.381) and canonical correlation (.525). The third function which only weakly separated the groups, is based on the "shortness" of the period of singlehood and being employed full-time in 1968. The percent correct classification indicates the proportion of each group appropriately classified in each analysis. With six groups, the odds that a case would be placed in the correct group by chance is 1 in 6, or less than 17%. The percentages in the first analysis were higher for the consecutive workers groups (Patterns 1, 5 and 6), especially those with an initial year of graduate school. The second analysis was strongest at predicting those without career involvement (Pattern 4), and those with graduate school (Patterns 5 and 6)--this latter may be due to the achievement variables included. The third analysis allowed for a fairly high percent correct classification for all groups, except for Pattern 5.

Discussion and Summary

On balance, Hareven's emphasis on life course--with its focus on the synchronization of individual career and family situations-- seems most applicable to the findings of this study, since it stresses the *interaction* and *contingency* of career and family outcomes which these data seem to substantiate. Tables 2 and 3 showed how the interaction of career patterns and marital/fertility status were contingent on earlier career preferences and affected attitudes toward employment subsequently. The career preferences suggest the type of meshing between career and family roles that a woman desired (clearly to want to pursue only a career, exclusive of housewifery, or *vice versa* is, in a sense, to avoid "meshing"). The affect toward full-time employment and the long-term satisfaction with career represents an outcome of the meshing process. Clearly timing is the essence of the synchronization process. The third analysis of Table 5 showed a close relationship between the timing of the birth of the oldest child and career patterns. The discriminant analyses also indicate a cumulative impact of earlier patterns and interactions of career and family situations on later career outcomes. While there was only weak evidence that family of orientation factors were predictive of early career patterns in young adulthood, there was much stronger evidence that these post-graduate work experiences (or the lack of them) were predictive of later career, marriage, and fertility statuses.

These longitudinal analyses accentuate how the temporal order of earlier life events move a woman toward different career positions.

It would be difficult to delineate a "normative" order of life events for this cohort; variation was the norm. While some combinations were representative of no one, no career/marital pattern represented a majority. Nor was any most desirable order evident. Women with consistent career experiences often had much less strong career sentiments, though those without career experience rarely held strong career intentions.

Hareven's stress on the importance of considering historical processes is germane. The period represented by these data suggests a curious problem for the study of synchronization. In the 1960s, educated women were pursuing careers in ever-increasing numbers. They also were reducing the levels of fertility characteristic of the "baby boom" 1950s. Yet it appears that their attitudes had not caught up with their behavior. Considering only those with early work experience (Pattern 1), a number of inferences can be drawn. Only a little over a third of the still unmarried Pattern 1 women regarded career as a major source of life satisfaction in 1968, even though four-fifths were employed full-time in that year. While over a third of the Pattern 1 mothers of one in 1968 worked full-time, less than 3% regarded a career as their major source of life satisfaction. It is not surprising that most women placed family over career. But it is striking that 97% of university-educated women who had worked most of their post-graduate years and borne only one child by age 28, still regarded their family

as their major source of life satisfaction. For this period of the 1960s, few women at any point of their life course placed career goals ahead of family. In the decade during which the "second" feminist movement emerged, the vast majority of educated women had yet to accept its tenets.

REFERENCES

Bielby, Denise Del Vento

1975 "Factors affecting career commitment of female college graduates: 1961-68." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Wisconsin.

Davis, James A.

1964 Great Aspirations: The Graduate School Plans of America's College Seniors. Chicago: Aldine.

Elder, Glen H., Jr.

1978 "Family history and the life course." Pp. 17-64 in Tamara K. Hareven (ed.), Transitions: The Family and the Life Course in Historical Perspective. New York: Academic Press.

Estes, Richard J., and Harold L. Wilensky.

1978 "Life cycle squeeze and the morale curve." Social Problems 25: 278-92.

Glick, Paul C.

1947 "The family life cycle." American Sociological Review 12: 164-74.

1977 "Updating the life cycle of the family." Journal of Marriage and the Family 39: 5-14.

Hareven, Tamara K.

1978a "Cycles, courses and cohorts: reflections on theoretical and methodological approaches to the historical study of family development." Journal of Social History 12: 97-109.

1978b "Introduction: the historical study of the life course."

Pp. 1-16 in Tamara K. Hareven (ed.), Transitions: The Family and the Life Course in Historical Perspective. New York: Academic Press.

Hill, Reuben

1964 "Methodological issues in family development research." Family Process 3: 186-206.

Hodge, Robert W., and Paul M. Siegel

1964 "Methods and procedures for rating occupations." Unpublished ms. National Opinion Research Center.

Hodge, Robert W., Paul M. Siegel, and Peter H. Rossi

1964 "Occupational prestige in the United States: 1925-1963." American Journal of Sociology 70: 286-302.

Hogan, Dennis P.

1978 "The variable order of events in the life course. "American Sociological Review 43: 573-86.

1980 "The Transition to Adulthood." American Sociological Review 45: 261-76.

Leibowitz, Arleen

1975 "Education and the allocation of women's time." Pp. 171-98 in F. Thomas Juster (ed.), Education, Income and Human Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Nock, Steven L.

1979 "The family life cycle: empirical or conceptual tool?" Journal of Marriage and the Family 41: 15-26.

Rapoport, Rhona, and Robert Rapoport

1969 "The dual career family: a variant pattern and social change." Human Relations 22: 3-30.

Rosenzweig, Mark R., and Kenneth I. Wolpin

1980 "Life-cycle supply and fertility: causal inferences from household models." Journal of Political Economy 88: 328-48.

Simpson, Richard L., and Ida H. Simpson

1961 "Occupational choice among career-oriented college women." Marriage and Family Living 23: 377-83.

Spanier, Graham B., William Sauer, and Robert Larzelere

1979 "An empirical evaluation of the family life cycle." Journal of Marriage and the Family 41: 27-38.

Turner, Ralph

1964 "Some aspects of women's ambition." American Journal of Sociology 70: 271-85.

Waite, Linda J.

1980 "Working wives and the family life cycle." American Journal of Sociology 86: 272-94.

Young, Christabel M.

1978 "Work sequences of women during the family life cycle." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40: 401-11.

Table 1. Fifteen Major Post-Graduate Career Patterns and Rankings by Marital/Fertility Status Groups: 1961 National Sample of U.S. University Graduate Women

Career Patterns 1962-63-64					% of Total	% of Top 15	Rank Order by Marital/Fertility Statuses 1964							
							Single		Married Childless		Married One Child		Married Two Children	
							Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%	Rank	%
Pattern 1	F	F	F	765	33.2	42.7	1	61.2	1	58.8	4	12.9	4.5	2.0
Pattern 2	F	F	H	245	10.6	13.7	9	2.5	2	8.9	1	37.6	4.5	2.0
Pattern 3	F	H	H	182	7.9	10.2	12	1.0	14	.6	2	22.0	1	45.4
Pattern 4	H	H	H	136	5.9	7.6		0.0	15	.4	3	14.0	2	44.7
Pattern 5	F	F	G/F	71	3.1	4.0	2	6.8	4.5	4.3	9	1.1		0.0
Pattern 6	G	F	F	69	3.0	3.9	3	6.0	3	5.8		0.0		0.0
Pattern 7	F	G/F	F	57	2.5	3.2	5	4.5	6	3.4	8	2.1	6.5	.7
Pattern 8	G/F	F	F	54	2.3	3.0	4	4.8	4.5	4.3	11.5	.2		0.0
Pattern 9	F	F	P	39	1.7	2.2	10	1.9	9.5	1.7	5	3.8		0.0
Pattern 10	G	G	G	34	1.5	1.9	6	3.7	9.5	1.7	10	.4		0.0
Pattern 11	F	H	F	30	1.3	1.7		0.0	7	3.2	7	2.5	6.5	.7
Pattern 12	F	P	H	29	1.3	1.6		0.0	12	1.3	6	3.2	3	4.6
Pattern 13	G/F	G/F	F	28	1.2	1.6	8	2.7	8	2.0		0.0		0.0
Pattern 14	G	G	G/P	26	1.1	1.5	7	3.3	13	.9		0.0		0.0
Pattern 15	F	G/F	G/F	26	1.1	1.5	11	1.6	11	2.8	11.5	.2		0.0
Totals				1791	77.7		n=629		n=537		n=473		n=152	

Note: F=Full-time employment, P=Part-time employment, G=Graduate School, G/F=Graduate School and Full-time employment, G/P=Graduate School and Part-time employment.

Table 2. Six Major Career Patterns (1962-1964) by Earlier (1962) Long-Run Preference for Employment/Housewifery by 1962 Marital-Fertility Status

1962-64 Career Pattern	Earlier (1962) Long-Run Career Preference by 1962 Marital Fertility Status: Single				
	Employment Only	Combine Housewife/ Career	Housewife now Employment Later	Housewife to Occasional Employment	Housewife Only
FFF	80.0	70.3	52.0	61.1	65.6
FFH	3.3	20.5	17.6	18.7	12.0
FHH	0.0	0.3	7.8	4.2	16.0
HHH	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.4
FFG/F	10.0	6.6	9.8	7.3	2.8
GFF	6.7	2.3	12.8	8.3	3.2
(N)	(30)	(259)	(102)	(288)	(250)

1962-64 Career Pattern	Earlier (1962) Long-Run Career Preference by 1962 Marital Fertility Status: Married Childless				
	Employment Only	Combine Housewife/ Career	Housewife now Employment Later	Housewife to Occasional Employment	Housewife Only
FFF	—	52.4	50.0	51.1	40.9
FFH	—	23.2	5.0	29.8	27.8
FHH	—	8.5	20.0	6.4	13.2
HHH	—	1.2	0.0	5.3	16.7
FFG/F	—	6.4	15.0	0.0	1.4
GFF	—	8.5	10.0	7.4	0.0
(N)	(1)	(82)	(20)	(94)	(144)

1962-64 Career Pattern	Earlier (1962) Long-Run Career Preference by 1962 Marital-Fertility Status: Married One Child				
	Employment Only	Combine Housewife/ Career	Housewife now Employment Later	Housewife to Occasional Employment	Housewife Only
FFF	—	0.0	0.0	1.9	3.4
FFH	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1
FHH	—	50.0	31.7	40.4	48.9
HHH	—	28.6	68.3	57.7	46.6
FFG/F	—	21.4	0.0	0.0	0.0
GFF	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
(N)	(1)	(14)	(41)	(52)	(88)

Table 3. Attitudes toward Full-time Employment in 1964 by Six Major Patterns for Same Year Married Women with Varying Parity

Attitude toward Full-time Employment: 1964	Six Patterns for 1964 Married Women																	
	Married Childless						Married One Child						Married Two Children					
	FFF	FFH	FHH	HHH	FFG/F	GFF	FFF	FFH	FHH	HHH	FFG/F	GFF	FFF	FFH	FHH	HHH	FFG/F	G
Very Positive	33.2	27.1	0.0	0.0	32.2	80.0	37.7	4.0	0.0	4.5	100.0	--	33.3	0.0	2.9	0.0	--	
Mildly Positive	27.7	4.2	0.0	0.0	43.5	16.0	37.7	5.7	1.0	16.7	0.0	--	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	--	
Neutral	6.1	39.6	66.7	50.0	4.3	4.0	1.6	6.3	1.0	3.0	0.0	--	33.0	0.0	0.0	4.4	--	
Mildly Negative	10.6	20.8	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	16.4	24.7	33.0	18.2	0.0	--	0.0	0.0	14.5	20.6	--	
Very Negative	2.3	8.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.6	59.2	65.0	57.6	0.0	--	0.0	100.0	82.6	75.0	--	
n	(310)	(48)	(3)	(2)	(23)	(25)	(61)	(174)	(103)	(66)	(4)	(0)	(3)	(3)	(69)	(68)	(0)	(

Table 4. 1968 Career Activites/Attainments and Satisfaction by Six Major Career Pattern Groups by Marital/Fertility Status: 1961 College Graduate Women

	(1) FFF	(2) FFH	(3) FHH	(4) HHH	(5) FFG/F	(6) GFF
Single 1968	(206)	(7)	(6)	(0)	(21)	(12)
Career Activities						
Full-time Employment	79.1	100.0	100.0	—	100.0	100.0
Part-time Employment	10.2	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0
Enrolled Graduate School	15.5	85.7	0.0	—	57.1	0.0
Career Attainment						
High Level Occupational Prestige	5.3	85.7	0.0	—	0.0	61.5
Middle Level Occupational Prestige	56.8	0.0	0.0	—	42.9	15.4
Housewife	8.3	0.0	0.0	—	0.0	0.0
Major Source of Life Satisfaction:						
Career	35.4	0.0	0.0	—	47.6	61.5
Married Childless 1968	(157)	(12)	(0)	(0)	(13)	(12)
Career Activities						
Full-time Employment	68.8	25.0	—	—	92.3	58.3
Part-time Employment	14.0	8.3	—	—	7.7	25.0
Enrolled Graduate School	12.7	0.0	—	—	7.7	0.0
Career Attainment						
High Level Occupational Prestige	3.8	0.0	—	—	15.4	8.3
Middle Level Occupational Prestige	49.0	41.7	—	—	76.9	50.0
Housewife	17.2	58.3	—	—	0.0	16.7
Major Source of Life Satisfaction:						
Career	9.6	75.0	—	—	0.0	8.3
Married One Child 1968	(232)	(38)	(16)	(10)	(21)	(31)
Career Activities						
Full-time Employment	36.2	7.9	6.3	0.0	14.3	0.0
Part-time Employment	15.9	13.2	37.5	10.0	4.8	25.8
Enrolled Graduate School	7.8	18.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.2
Career Attainment						
High Level Occupational Prestige	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Middle Level Occupational Prestige	43.5	18.4	6.3	10.0	4.8	25.8
Housewife	47.4	78.9	56.3	90.0	81.0	74.2
Major Source of Life Satisfaction:						
Career	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Married Two or More Children 1968	(170)	(188)	(160)	(126)	(16)	(13)
Career Activities						
Full-time Employment	12.9	4.3	3.7	7.9	6.3	0.0
Part-time Employment	7.1	7.4	5.6	4.0	0.0	0.0
Enrolled Graduate School	5.9	2.7	10.0	2.4	6.3	0.0
Career Attainment						
High Level Occupational Prestige	0.0	1.6	.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
Middle Level Occupational Prestige	15.3	10.1	10.6	8.7	6.3	0.0
Housewife	82.4	88.3	86.9	86.5	93.8	100.0
Major Source of Life Satisfaction:						
Career	8.8	1.1	1.2	4.8	0.0	0.0

Table 5. Discriminant Effects of Family of Origin, Pre-Graduation, and Seven-Year Post-Graduation Variables on Six Major Early Career Pattern Groups: (1) Full-time Workers, (2) Late Dropouts, (3) Early Dropouts, (4) Consecutive Housewives, (5) Work/Late Graduate School, (6) Early Graduate School/Work

	Discriminating Effects						Canonical Discriminating Functions		Percent Correct Classification					
	Func 1	Func 2	Func 3	Rao's V	Change in Rao's V	Sig. of Change	Canonical Correlation	Eigen Value	(1) FFF	(2) FFH	(3) FHH	(4) HHH	(5) FFG/F	(6 GF
First Discriminant Analysis														
							Function 1 .258	.071						
							Function 2 .206	.045	30.7	2.4	22.4	11.7	28.2	56.
Father College Graduate[a]	.506	-.039		40.92	40.92	.00								
Reared Small Town	-.069	-.784		67.07	26.14	.00								
Number of Siblings	-.403	.384		89.81	22.75	.00								
Mother Employed	-.208	.065		103.19	13.38	.02								
Reared Catholic	-.173	.407		113.02	9.83	.08								
Father's Occupational Prestige	.403	.114		122.24	9.22	.10								
Second Discriminant Analysis														
							Function 1 .217	.050						
							Function 2 .206	.044	0.0	0.0	0.0	89.8	36.6	40.
Strong Preference for Future Employment (1962)	.121	-.983		39.64	39.64	.00								
College Grade Point Average: A	.916	.067		76.61	39.97	.00								
College Quality: High	.425	.158		88.22	11.61	.04								
Third Discriminant Analysis														
							Function 1 .791	1.669						
							Function 2 .525	.381						
Age of Oldest Child	-.976	-.297	.060	1352.38	1352.38	.00	Function 3 .269	.078	48.2	51.0	43.2	65.7	16.9	66.
Graduate Degree Attained	.117	-.840	.149	1682.24	329.86	.00								
Full-time Employment 1968	.082	.380	.512	1752.43	70.19	.00								
Years in Graduate School	.195	-.204	.109	1814.28	61.84	.00								
Length of Singlehood	.085	-.060	-.719	1852.63	38.35	.00								
Major Source of Life Satisfaction: Career	.153	.096	.266	1889.88	37.25	.00								
Number of Children 1968	.140	.072	-.399	1915.38	25.51	.00								
Part-time Employment 1968	.069	.149	-.009	1933.62	18.24	.00								
Enrolled in Graduate School 1968	-.075	.038	-.322	1951.39	17.77	.00								

[a]Variables: Father College Graduate: scored 1 if R's father was a college graduate, scored 0 otherwise; Reared Small Town: scored 1 if R was reared in a community of population 10,000 or less; Number of Siblings: number of brothers and sisters reported by R; Mother Employed: scored 1 if R's mother was eve employed at any time since R's birth; Reared Catholic: scored 1 if R reported being reared as a Roman Catholic; Father's Occupational Prestige: father's NORC Prestige Scale Score when R was 15 years of age; Strong Preference for Future Employment: scored 1 if R had a long-run preference for employment only or combining employment with housewifery; College Grade Point Average: A: scored 1 if R reported an A or A- grade point average--scored 0 otherwise; College Quality: High: scored 1 if undergraduate college from which R graduated is categorized as Class I (High) in the School Quality Index developed by Davis (1964); Age of Oldest Child: age in 1968 of oldest child of R; Graduate Degree Attained: scored 1 if R reported highest degree attained as Master's Professional or Doctorate--scored 0 otherwise; Full-time Employment 1968: scored 1 if R reported working 35 or more hours; Years of Graduate School: refers to the number of full-time year equivalents of completed graduate study (e.g., 3 summers count as one year, etc.); Length of Singlehood: based on t cumulative number of time periods encompassed by the five waves in which R was single; Major Source of Life Satisfaction: Career: scored 1 if R reported major source of satisfaction to be a career in 1968, scored 0 otherwise; Number of Children 1968: number of children reported by R in 1968; Part-time Employment 1968: scored 1 if R reported working fewer than 35 hours per week, scored 0 otherwise; Enrolled in Graduate School 1968: scored 1 if R enrolle in graduate school in 1968, scored 0 otherwise.